



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/015,501

12/11/2001

Kerry Champion

23982-11568

6519

758 7590 07/25/2008  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA STREET  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/015,501 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>CHAMPION, KERRY |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>ADNAN M. MIRZA    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2145                |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabo (7,395,349) and further in view of Arteaga et al (U.S. 2002/0161826).

As per claims 1,17,33,41-42,53-54,56 Szabo disclosed traffic manager for facilitating communication between a client node and a server node in a distributed computing environment in accordance with at least one policy, the server node having a first interface associated therewith (col. 2, lines 28-45), the traffic manager capable of communicating with both the client code and the server node and comprising a central processing unit which is operable to: communicate with the server node via the first interface, generate and publish at least a second interface for communication with the first interface, in accordance with said at least one policy (col. 8, lines 42-48). At least one policy mapping the first interface to the second interface (col. 8, lines 49-63);

However Szabo did not disclose in detail communicate with the client node via the second interface, thereby allowing the client node to access at least one service on the server node in accordance with the at least one policy.

In the same field of endeavor Arteaga disclosed, If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object (Page. 8, Paragraph. 0116).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object as taught by Arteaga in the method of Szabo to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

3. As per claims 2,18,34,43,55 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first and second interfaces comprises Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

4. As per claims 3,19 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the SOAP interfaces employ Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

5. As per claims 4,20,35 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein each of the first and second interfaces has a description language file associated therewith defining the associated interface (Szabo, col. 13, lines 44-64).

6. As per claims 5,21,36 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first interface corresponds to one of HTTP, TCP, HTTPS, HTTPR, and MQ (Szabo, col. 7, lines 45-61).

7. As per claims 6,22 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise including the server node, and wherein the client node is external to the network (Szabo, col. 8, lines 49-64).

8. As per claims 7,23 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise and including both the client and server nodes (Szabo, col. 9, lines 27-37).

9. As per claims 8,24,40,44 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes requiring authorization by a human operator for invocation of the at least one service (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

10. As per claims 9,25,41,45 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes 5 mapping an organizational role to a person (Arteaga, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0114).

11. As per claims 10,26,46 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the mapping of the organizational role to the person is done using an LDAP directory associated with the distributed computing environment (Arteaga, Page. 4, Paragraph. 0060).

12. As per claims 11,27,37,47 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is a security policy (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

13. As per claims 12,28,48 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with encryption or decryption of at least a portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

14. As per claims 13,29,49 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with generating or verifying at least one digital signature for at least one portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

15. As per claims 14,30,38,50 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with protection against service attacks (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

16. As per claims 15,31,39,51 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with enforcing policies with respect to publication or access to the first or second interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

17. As per claims 16,32,40,52 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with review of data communicated between the server and client nodes (Szabo, col. 11, lines 16-25).

18. As per claim 54 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed a computer-implemented method for facilitating communication between server and client programs, the method comprising: reading a WSDL file associated with a first SOAP interface to at least one server program (Szabo, col. 11, lines 16-25); and generating or publishing at least a second SOAP interface corresponding to the first SOAP interface in accordance with at least one policy; wherein at least one client program can use the second SOAP interface to request one or more services (Arteaga, Page. 1, Paragraph. 0009).

19. As per claim 55 Szabo-Arteaga disclosed wherein the method further comprises: reading a first UDDI file which lists the first SOAP interface; generating or publishing a second WSDL file which describes the second SOAP interface; and creating or updating at least one UDDI entry associated with the generated or published WSDL file (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0095).

### ***Response to Arguments***

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

22. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A. M. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 2145

Adnan Mirza



/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145